DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 473 SP 003 559

AUTHOR SOKOL, ALVIN P.; MARSHALL, JON C.
TITLE THE CONGRUENCE OF TEACHER EXPECTATIONS. INQUIRY INTO INNOVATIONS SERIES. RESEARCH REPORT 4.
INSTITUTION UNIVERSITY CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, MO.
PUB DATE DEC 69
NOTE 48P.

EDRS PRICE EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.50
DESCRIPTORS AMERICAN HISTORY, BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES, *CLASSROOM COMMUNICATION, COURSE OBJECTIVES, HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, *ROLE PERCEPTION, SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS, STUDENT ATTITUDES, STUDENT BEHAVIOR, *STUDENT ROLE, *TEACHER INFLUENCE
IDENTIFIERS WAS, WATSON ANALYSIS SCHEDULE

ABSTRACT

AN INVESTIGATION WAS CONDUCTED TO DETERMINE THE MAGNITUDE AND DIRECTION OF THE CONGRUENCE OF COMMUNICATED EXPECTATIONS FOR TEACHERS AND STUDENTS IN THE UNIVERSITY CITY (MISSOURI) AMERICAN STUDIES PROGRAM (AN 11TH GRADE HISTORY-LITERATURE, PROCESS ORIENTED CURRICULUM; (SEE SP 003 560) AND FOR TWO CONVENTIONAL AMERICAN HISTORY PROGRAMS. A PREVIOUS STUDY (ED 026 686) HAD INDICATED THAT THE AMERICAN STUDIES PROGRAM AS PERCEIVED BY THE STUDENTS REFLECTED CRITICAL STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN PROBLEM-SOLVING AND DECISIONMAKING, THE CONVERSE BEING INDICATED BY AMERICAN HISTORY STUDENTS. THE WATSON ANALYSIS SCHEDULE (WAS), FORM A, WAS ADMINISTERED TO THE THREE GROUPS OF 525, 550, AND 657 STUDENTS AND TO THEIR 29 TEACHERS TO MEASURE PERCEPTIONS OF EXPLICITLY STATED, ACTUAL, AND REALIZED EXPECTATIONS. PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS AND Z-TESTS FOR SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCE WERE RUN IN THE DATA ANALYSIS. MAJOR FINDINGS: A HIGH DEGREE OF CORRELATION WAS ATTAINED FOR THE EXPLICIT AND ACTUAL EXPECTATIONS OF STUDENTS AND TEACHERS IN EACH OF THE THREE PROGRAMS. THERE APPEARS TO BE HIGHER CONGRUENCE BETWEEN STUDENTS AND TEACHERS IN BOTH CONVENTIONAL PROGRAM GROUPS; HOWEVER, STATISTICS DO NOT SUPPORT EITHER A STRONGLY POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE RELATION. WHAT AMERICAN STUDIES TEACHERS COMMUNICATE TO STUDENTS APPEARS TO BE THE GENERAL ORIENTATION FOR STUDENT BEHAVIOR AND NOT EXPECTATIONS FOR WELL DELIMITED BEHAVIORAL OPERATIONS, PER SE. (THE WAS IS INCLUDED.) (JS)

ED036473

THE CONGRUENCE OF TEACHER EXPECTATIONS

(Research Report IV)

December 1969

Demonstration Schools Project
University City Senior High School
Title III of ESEA Public Law 89-10
Ronald M. Compton, Director

INQUIRY INTO INNOVATIONS SERIES

Report Prepared by:

Alvin P. Sokol

Jon C. Marshall

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SP003559

THE CONGRUENCE OF TEACHER EXPECTATIONS:

AMERICAN STUDIES AND CONVENTIONAL AMERICAN HISTORY PROGRAMS

SP003559

ALVIN P. SOKOL
Research Coordinator
Special Projects Office
University City School District
University City, Missouri 63130

JON C. MARSHALL
Consultant, School of Education
University of Missouri-St. Louis
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

with

ELIZABETH P. WATSON
Social Studies Education
School of Education
University of Missouri-St. Louis
St. Louis, Missouri 63121

Manuscript typed by Mrs. Kathryn Schragin
Special Projects Office
University City School District
University City, Missouri 63130

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS	*ii*
LIST OF TABLES	*iii*
LIST OF FIGURES	*iv*
INTRODUCTION	1
THEORETICAL ORIENTATION	2
PURPOSE	3
METHOD	5
PREVIOUS FINDINGS: A REVIEW	11
CURRENT FINDINGS: CONGRUENCE	19
INTERPRETATIONS	27
REFERENCES	31
APPENDIX A: Watson Analysis Schedule	32

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Teacher Factors Associated With Programs	13
2	Student Factors Associated With Programs	15
3	Correlations Between Teachers and Students in Ep, C1, and C2 for Parts I, II, and III of the WAS	20
4	Significance of the Differences for Student-Teacher Correlations Among Ep, C1, and C2 on Parts I, II and III of the WAS	22
5	Correlations of Students Between the Three Parts of the WAS for Ep, C1, and C2	23
6	Significance of the Differences of the Correlations Among Ep, C1, and C2 Between Parts of the WAS for Students	24
7	Correlations of Teachers Between the Three Parts of the WAS for Ep, C1, and C2	25
8	Significance of the Differences of the Correlations Among Ep, C1, and C2 Between Parts of the WAS for Teachers	26

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1	Graphic illustration of congruence between students and teachers for Ep, C1, and C2.	21
2	Graphic illustration of congruence of students among the three parts of the WAS for Ep, C1, and C2	23
3	Graphic illustration of congruence of teachers for Ep, C1, and C2 between the three parts of the WAS	25

The Congruence of Teacher Expectations: American Studies and Conventional American History Programs

Introduction

Learning takes place when the experiences are meaningful in terms of the goals of the learner. Whatever a student does is done in terms of his private view of what he ought to do, given the situation as he sees it. It involves what he thinks he is doing, what he thinks is involved in the task, and the previous experiences with the task. Learning is usually related to the purposes of the learner rather than to purposes of the teacher (Boyer, *et. al.*).

The foregoing statement reflects in part the basic beliefs under which the University City High School is operating. The emphasis here is on the individual student; on his perceptions of his needs and abilities, of the teacher's expectations, and of his actual behaviors. This emphasis upon the student's perception of the learning situation is consistent with the cognitive theory of learning (Craig, 1966).

The American Studies program has been cited as reflecting University City High School's move "away from the traditional classroom" (Balcom, 1968). The goals for this program emphasize higher-order mental processes which are important in teaching students to think, in contrast with such programs as might emphasize the rote memorization of information (Sokol and Marshall, 1968).

Theoretical Orientation

The direction of current innovations in the social studies curriculum is toward a process oriented position (Berman, 1968). In general the nature of the innovations is a deviation from the conventional content position in terms of changes in curricular and administrative organization, based on an acceptance of different instructional goals and assumptions (Hunt and Metcalfe, 1968). As has been previously indicated above, this direction of change can be noted in the American Studies program.

The results of past studies (Massialas, 1963; Oliver and Shaver, 1966), designed to research effective means of achieving process oriented goals, have failed to demonstrate significant differences in types of goal achievements between conventional and innovative procedures. Role theory (Getzels and Thelen, 1960) would imply that successful goal attainment in the classroom would relate to at least three variables: (1) the means for achieving these goals which are employed by teachers, (2) the students' perception of the goals to be attained, and (3) the students' acceptance or rejection of the goals to be attained. The success of achieving these goals would be logically and psychologically dependent on adequate communication of the goals to the student and his acceptance of them (Broom and Selznick, 1955; Getzels and Thelen, 1960; Snygg, 1966).

When the statements from the separate disciplines of learning theory, role theory, and communications theory are arrayed in close proximity, as they are above, it becomes possible to note certain consistencies among them. All of them reflect a similar conceptual framework, albeit from separate vantage points. They seem to emphasize that in a learning situation, (1) the teacher and the students bring internalized sets into the situation, (2) either implicitly or explicitly, the teacher formulates and communicates goals to the students, (3)

the student's perception of this communication defines, for the student, his role expectation, and (4) the student's acceptance or rejection of the communicated role expectation defines his subsequent behavior. In this conceptualization, the teacher and the pupils are both reacting to messages sent from the teacher in terms of their respective internalized schemas. There are numerous aspects of these messages. One of these which would logically relate to role definition would be the communicated expectations of the teachers and the student's perception of these expectations.

It has been suggested by role theorists that the *efficiency* of the communication between sender (teacher) and receiver (student) is a basic determinant of the *quality* of the learning situation (*i.e.*, interest and satisfaction of the student). This efficiency might logically be determined by examining the congruence of the perceptions of the teacher and the students toward the content of the communicated message.

Thus, it would be of interest to examine this efficiency of communication in terms of the congruence of expectations as perceived by students and teachers. Of particular concern to the "new" emphasis of social studies would be a comparison of this congruence between process oriented and content oriented programs.

Purpose

The purpose of this investigation was to determine the magnitude and direction of the congruence of communicated expectations for teachers and students in the American Studies Program and for two conventional American history programs. For the purposes of this study, the communications were divided into the following three categories: (1) explicitly stated expectations, (2) actual

expectations, and (3) realized expectations. This study was designed to analyze the following research questions:

1. Will students and teachers in conventional programs show a greater, lesser, or the same degree of agreement on the expectations of student behavior when compared to students and teachers in the American Studies program?
2. Will students and teachers in conventional programs show a greater, lesser, or the same degree of agreement on actual student behavior when compared to students and teachers in the American Studies program?
3. Will the degree of congruence between what students think they are told they are expected to do and what they feel they are actually expected to do be greater, lesser, or the same between students in conventional programs and students in the American Studies program?
4. Will the degree of congruence between what students think they are told they are expected to do and what they feel they actually do be greater, lesser, or the same between students in conventional programs and students in the American Studies program?
5. Will the degree of congruence between what students think they are actually expected to do and what they feel they actually do be greater, lesser, or the same between students in conventional programs and students in the American Studies program?
6. Will the degree of congruence between what teachers indicate students have been told they are expected to do and what

teachers indicate is actually expected of students to do be greater, lesser, or the same between teachers in conventional programs and teachers in the American Studies program?

7. Will the degree of congruence between what teachers indicate students have been told they are expected to do and what teachers indicate students actually do be greater, lesser, or the same between teachers in conventional programs and teachers in the American Studies program?
8. Will the degree of congruence between what teachers indicate students are actually expected to do and what teachers indicate students actually do be greater, lesser, or the same between teachers in conventional programs and teachers in the American Studies program?

Method

This study is a continuation of the initial investigation into the American Studies program. The purpose therein was to determine the extent to which that program is associated with differing role expectations of students and teachers, compared to those in conventional American history programs. The research for that study was conducted during the Spring, 1968 semester. The report was completed in December and was issued as Part IV of Inquiry Into Innovations, Research Report I, 1968.* Since this study consists of a different mode of analyses of the original data which were collected, a detailed description of the data collection and the instrument will not be presented. A complete description may be found in the aforementioned study (pp. 42-47).

*ED032010

The general plan for these studies was to obtain selected measurements on students' perceptions of their learning behavior for students enrolled in American Studies and for students who were enrolled in two conventional American history courses. The same measurements were obtained for the teachers of these courses.

The measurement instrument used for these investigations was the Watson Analysis Schedule, Form A (WAS). A copy of the schedule is presented in Appendix A of this report. The schedule is divided into three parts with each part containing the same 71 items but consisting of different directions for responding to the items.

Part I represents the students' perceptions of expectations which were communicated through explicit verbalizations.

Part II represents the students' perceptions of expectations which were (1) communicated explicitly and not rejected on the basis of conflicting implicit communication, (2) communicated explicitly but rejected on the basis of conflicting implicit communication, and (3) communicated implicitly by cues other than the verbalization of the expectations.

Part III represents the students' perceptions of actual behavior and, theoretically, indicates by compliance or non-compliance, the acceptance or rejection of the expected behavior as being consistent with his own need disposition.

As was previously indicated the sample consisted of the students and teachers in the American Studies classes and conventional American history classes. The students and teachers in the American Studies program were denoted the experimental group (Ep). The comparison groups consisted of students and teachers from two school districts in St. Louis County which ranked closest to

University City on the basis of 16 variables. These groups were denoted the control sample and were labeled Groups C1 and C2. The total enrollment in the three programs were 525, 550, and 657, for Ep, C1, and C2, respectively.

The WAS was administered to all the students and teachers in the three programs during the months of April and May, 1968. For the initial investigation the analyses utilized all 29 teachers ($n_{Ep} = 12$, $n_{C1} = 8$, $n_{C2} = 9$) and a randomly-selected sample of 30 students from each program, with each teacher being represented in the sample. The statistical procedures included Principal Axis Factor Analysis, Q Technique, on each scale of the WAS for both teachers and students. Follow-up tests on the resulting factor solutions were run to determine the significances of differences among the groups.

In the present study the analyses utilized all 29 teachers and the total student population in each of the three programs. These analyses were divided into three segments: (1) Teachers, Parts, (2) Students, Parts, (3) Student-Teacher.

Teachers, Parts. The responses to the WAS for the three teacher groups were analyzed using nine Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between each of the three parts, for the three groups. The expected values, *i.e.*, the arithmetic means, were determined for the 213 items for each of the three teacher groups. The expected values were determined because the primary question of interest was the degree of relation (*i.e.*, congruence) among the corresponding expected item responses for the three parts of the WAS for each teacher group.

In order to determine the index for congruence, Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated for the following relations for the teachers between the scales of the WAS:

1. Ep -- correlation of the expected item values on Part I and corresponding expected item values on Part II

2. Ep -- correlation of the expected item values on Part I and corresponding expected item values on Part III

3. Ep -- correlation of the expected item values on Part II and corresponding expected item values on Part III

4. C1 -- correlation of the expected item values on Part I and corresponding expected item values on Part II

5. C1 -- correlation of the expected item values on Part I and corresponding expected item values on Part III

6. C1 -- correlation of the expected item values on Part II and corresponding expected item values on Part III

7. C2 -- correlation of the expected item values on Part I and corresponding expected item values on Part II

8. C2 -- correlation of the expected item values on Part I and corresponding expected item values on Part III

9. C2 -- correlation of the expected item values on Part II and corresponding expected item values on Part III

The purpose of these analyses was to determine the degree of consistency among the explicitly stated expectations, actual expectations and realized expectations as seen by the teachers. These degrees of consistency (*i.e.*, correlation coefficients) were compared among the three teacher groups in order to determine the significance of the differences in consistency between each pair of groups. Nine z-tests for the significance of the difference between two correlation coefficients were run to complete this set of analyses.

Students, Parts. The responses to the WAS by the three complete student groups were analyzed using nine Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients; between each of the three parts, for the three groups. These analyses were done in the same manner as previously described for the teacher groups. The expected values were determined for the 213 items for each of the three student groups. Correlation coefficients were determined as indices of the relations

(*i.e.*, congruence) among the three parts of the WAS for the expected values of the items. Thus, the following relations for the students among the scales of the WAS were determined.

1. Ep -- the expected item values on Part I and corresponding expected item values on Part II .
2. Ep -- the expected item values on Part I and corresponding expected item values on Part III
3. Ep -- the expected item values on Part II and corresponding expected item values on Part III
4. C1 -- the expected item values on Part I and corresponding expected item values on Part II
5. C1 -- the expected item values on Part I and corresponding expected item values on Part III
6. C1 -- the expected item values on Part II and corresponding expected item values on Part III
7. C2 -- the expected item values on Part I and corresponding expected item values on Part II
8. C2 -- the expected item values on Part I and corresponding expected item values on Part III
9. C2 -- the expected item values on Part II and corresponding expected item values on Part III

The purpose of these analyses was to determine the degree of consistency among the explicitly stated student expectations, actual student expectations and realized expectations as perceived by the students. These degrees of consistency (*i.e.*, correlation coefficients) were compared among the three student groups in order to determine the significance of the differences in consistency between each pair of groups. Nine z-tests for the significance of the difference between correlation coefficients were run to complete this set of analyses.

Students-Teachers. The relation between the responses of the students and the responses of the teachers was analyzed using nine Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients; between the students and teachers in each program for the three parts. The expected values were determined for the 213 items for each of the six sample groups. Correlation coefficients were determined as indices of the relations between the expected item values of students and teachers on each of the parts of the WAS. Thus, the following relations between students and teachers on the responses to the WAS were determined.

1. Ep -- the expected item values on Part I for students and teachers
2. Ep -- the expected item values on Part II for students and teachers
3. Ep -- the expected item values on Part III for students and teachers
4. C1 -- the expected item values on Part I for students and teachers
5. C1 -- the expected item values on Part II for students and teachers
6. C1 -- the expected item values on Part III for students and teachers
7. C2 -- the expected item values on Part I for students and teachers
8. C2 -- the expected item values on Part II for students and teachers
9. C2 -- the expected item values on Part III for students and teachers

The purpose of these analyses was to determine the degrees of consistency between students and teachers on the explicitly stated student expectations, actual student expectations, and realized expectations. These degrees of consistency (*i.e.*, correlation coefficients) were compared among the three student-

teacher groups in order to determine the significance of the difference in consistency between each pair of groups on each scale. Nine z-tests for the significance of the difference between two correlation coefficients were run to complete this set of analyses.

Previous Findings: a review

The primary purpose of the first investigation was to determine the extent to which the American Studies Program is associated with different role identification of students and teachers as compared to conventional programs. Toward this end, the WAS was administered to the students and teachers comprising the American Studies program (designated the Ep group), and to the students and teachers in two comparable high schools with conventional American history programs (designated groups C1 and C2).

The mode of analysis for comparing teachers' perceptions of students' roles and students' perceptions of their own roles consisted of Principal Axis Factor Analyses and Varimax Rotations of the obtained factor solutions. These solutions permitted the utilization of subsequent appropriate comparison techniques. The results indicated that there were systematic differences in expectations for students between American Studies teachers and American history teachers, and that there were differences in perceived expectations among students enrolled in these programs. These differences were found on all three parts of the WAS: Explicit Expectations, Actual Expectations, and Realized Expectations. Furthermore, they were apparent in the factor solutions obtained for the teachers and students on the three parts of the WAS.

The factor analyses for teachers yielded 7 to 9 factors, and those for students yielded 22 factors. However, in the latter analyses only the first 7 factors were large enough to yield useful information. The factors tended to establish teacher-centered recall as one orientation as opposed to student-

centered problem-solving, critical thinking, and decision-making as the other orientation. Even though there was a high degree of factor consistency among the three parts, it was evident that not all explicit and actual expectations were realized and, conversely, that not all realized expectations were formulated as explicit or actual ones.

Several of the factors were associated with subgroups of teachers and reflected expectations associated with specific programs (*i.e.*, American Studies or American history) or individual teachers independent of programs. These factors represented continua of responses. The descriptions presented (see Sokol and Marshall, 1968) reflected the extreme positions on the continua associated with positive factor loadings. A factor may be described from either extreme, and across the three parts may be described from both vantage points depending upon the directional (*i.e.*, + or -) scoring for the factor. The positively scored factors are described as *"toward..."* the general orientation, and the negatively scored factors are described as *"away from..."* the general orientation.

Seven factors were found to be associated with the programs. In each case, the American Studies teachers represented one end of the factor continuum and the American history teachers represented the other end. These factors and response directions are listed in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Teacher Factors Associated With Programs

WAS, Part	American Studies	American History
I	*Away from* past-oriented recall delimited by academic requirements as conventionally evaluated	*Toward* past-oriented recall delimited by academic requirements as conventionally evaluated
	Away from teacher as exclusive decision-maker, with non-critical acceptance by students	*Toward* teacher as exclusive decision-maker, with non-critical acceptance by students
	Toward student directed problem-solving, with significant decision-making	*Away from* student directed problem-solving, with significant decision-making
II	*Toward* teacher identified problems, with student centered problem-solving and decision-making	*Away from* teacher identified problems, with student centered problem-solving and decision-making
	Away from recall of teacher-determined content, *toward* student-centered problems	*Toward* recall of teacher-determined content, *away from* student-centered problems
III	*Away from* past-oriented uniform behavior, *toward* changed behavior in society	*Toward* past-oriented uniform behavior, *away from* changed behavior in society
	Away from teacher as exclusive decision-maker with non-critical acceptance by students	*Toward* teacher as exclusive decision-maker with non-critical acceptance by students

The American Studies program as perceived by the teachers entailed student-centered problem-solving with emphasis on current issues. The converse was indicated as a program characteristic by the American history teachers. The teacher-centered recall orientation of the American history teachers as compared to the student-centered problem-solving orientation of the American Studies teachers was also noted from examination of the items comprising these factors.

The general orientations for students were consistent with those noted for teachers. Teacher-centered recall emerged as one orientation versus student-centered critical participation in problem-solving and decision-making emerged as the other. However, many specific factor descriptions were not obtained on all three parts. It was evident that the students felt that not all explicit and actual expectations were realized and, conversely, that not all realized expectations were formulated as explicit or actual ones. The remaining factors were associated with subgroups of students and reflected expectations associated with specific programs (*i.e.*, American Studies or American history as presented in programs C1 or C2) or individual students independent of the programs in which they were enrolled. As with the descriptions of the teacher factors, the descriptions are reported from the vantage point of the extreme positions on the continua associated with positive factor loadings.

Several factors reflecting process-content orientations were found to be associated with the programs. In most cases the American Studies students typified one end of the factor continua and the American history students enrolled in one or both of the control programs typified the other end. In a few instances, students enrolled in one or the other of the two control programs displayed agreement with the American Studies position. These factors and response directions are listed in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Student Factors Associated With Programs

WAS, Part	American Studies	American History, C1	American History, C2
I	*Toward* decision-making and significant outcomes	*Toward* decision-making and significant outcomes	*Away from* decision-making and significant outcomes
	Toward student critical participation in problem-solving, *away from* past-oriented recall and uniformity		*Away from* student critical participation in problem-solving, *toward* past-oriented recall and uniformity
	Toward student participation in problem-solving, and relevant learnings; *away from* noncritical acceptance	*Away from* student participation in problem-solving, and relevant learnings; *toward* noncritical acceptance	
	Toward student as decision-maker, within an open and accepting climate	*Away from* student as decision-maker, within an open and accepting climate	*Toward* student as decision-maker, within an open and accepting climate
	Toward student critical participation in problem-solving decisions		*Away from* student critical participation in problem-solving decisions
II	*Away from* teachers as exclusive decision-maker, with noncritical acceptance by students; *toward* relevant mode of continued learning	*Away from* teachers as exclusive decision-maker, with noncritical acceptance by students; *toward* relevant mode of continued learning	*Toward* teacher as exclusive decision-maker, with noncritical acceptance by students; *away from* relevant mode of continued learning

TABLE 2 (continued)

WAS, Part	American Studies	American History, C1	American History, C2
II	*Toward* student critical participation in problem-solving and decision making, with "self"-social learning		*Away from* student critical participation in problem-solving and decision-making with "self"-social learning
		Away from acquisition of factual content, limited to the past, for future utility	*Toward* acquisition of factual content, limited to the past, for future utility
		Toward problems based on students' interests and experiences	*Away from* problems based on students' interests and experiences
III	*Toward* critical participation in problem-solving and enjoyment of activities		*Away from* critical participation in problem-solving and enjoyment of activities
	Toward critical participation in problem-solving, with an open climate; skill not limited to school application		*Away from* critical participation in problem-solving, with an open climate; skill not limited to school application
		Away from student-teacher interaction in limited problem-solving *with* making reports	*Toward* student-teacher interaction in limited problem-solving *without* making reports

TABLE 2 (continued)

WAS, Part	American Studies	American History, C1	American History, C2
III	*Toward* problem-solving and meaning, *away from* better citizenship *Toward* student participation in problem development, with self evaluation	*Away from* problem-solving and meaning, *toward* better citizenship	*Toward* problem-solving and meaning, *away from* better citizenship *Away from* student participation in problem development, with self evaluation

Examination of Table 2 will point up the consistency with which the American Studies students perceived their role as that of critical participation in problem-solving and decision-making. Comparison of these results with those of the American history students will underscore that they tended to perceive their role as that of non-critical acceptance on the part of students.

However, the difference between the two American history programs as perceived by the students combined with the partial similarities to the American Studies orientation reflected a lack of consistency in expectations for those two programs. It can be observed from Table 2 that this lack of consistency yielded conflicting expectations wherein students in both American history groups saw themselves as being in a program featuring *teacher-centered decision-making with non-critical acceptance by students*. In some instances they departed from this mode and reflected some characteristics of the student problem-solving and decision-making model. It should be noted that this conflict did not appear for the American history *teachers*.

The previous discussion has pointed to the general orientations reflected in these factors. *The American Studies program as indicated by the students reflected critical student participation in problem-solving and decision-making. The converse--however, with exceptions--was indicated by American history students as characterizing their programs.*

These results supported the learning statement prepared for University City School District (quoted on page 1) in that the *general goal orientation* of the American Studies program had been successfully communicated to the students and seemed to fit their need disposition as reflected in the realized expectations. This was further supported by the factor descriptions wherein

American Studies students evidenced an enjoyment of activities while the American history students in the most teacher-centered program indicated the converse.

Current Findings: Congruence

This study was designed to analyze several additional questions raised concerning the American Studies program. These questions relate specifically to the previous discussion concerning the efficiency of communication between teacher and student in the American Studies and the American history programs.

Congruence, as defined for this study, is the degree of relation between explicit - actual; explicit - realized; and actual - realized expectations as perceived by both teachers and students, separately, and by their interaction on each dimension. *Efficiency of communication* can be defined as the congruence between students and teachers of explicit and actual expectations. As thus defined, efficiency of communication is a subset of congruence.

Students-Teachers. The degree of congruence between the responses of teachers and students within programs was determined by use of Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients (r) for each of the three parts of the WAS.

The expected values for both teachers and students in each of the groups, Ep, C1, and C2, were determined for each of the 213 items on the inventory. The correlation coefficients represent the degrees of relation between students and teachers, within a group, on the 71 items comprising each part of the inventory. Each of the coefficients was transformed to its respective Fisher z scores*. These correlation coefficients and their respective Fisher z

---

*Since distributions of correlation coefficients are not normally distributed these z scores are necessary for statistical comparisons between groups.

transformations (z') are presented in Table 3. These results are schematically presented in Figure 1.

TABLE 3

Correlations Between Teachers and Students in Ep, C1, and C2 for Parts I, II, and III of the WAS

Program	Statistic	Parts		
		I	II	III
Ep	r	-.167	+.051	+.501
	z'	-.169	+.050	+.550
C1	r	-.355	+.310	+.425
	z'	-.371	+.321	+.454
C2	r	+.162	+.416	-.270
	z'	+.163	+.443	-.277

r = coefficient of correlation z' = Fisher z transformation

Congruences between teachers and students were compared among the three groups. Differences between programs were analyzed by comparing the respective indices of relation for Ep *versus* C1, Ep *versus* C2, and C1 *versus* C2. Since Fisher z's are normalized indices corresponding to the correlation coefficients, they form the basis for comparison in this statistical analysis utilizing z-tests. The calculated statistics and their significance are reported in Table 4 for the three parts of the WAS. All differences were found to be significant at least at the .05 level of confidence.

Part	Line Graph of Correlation Coefficients
I Explicit	C1 Ep C2 -1.00 -.75 -.50 -.25 0 +.25 +.50 +.75 +1.00
II Actual	Ep C1 C2 -1.00 -.75 -.50 -.25 0 +.25 +.50 +.75 +1.00
III Realized	C2 C1 Ep -1.00 -.75 -.50 -.25 0 +.25 +.50 +.75 +1.00

Figure 1. Graphic illustration of congruence between students and teachers for Ep, C1, and C2.

It can be noted in Table 3 that students and teachers in the Experimental program did not agree on the explicit or actual expectations and, thus, indicated an extreme lack of efficiency in the communication of specific expectations. However, there was a .501 correlation between students and teachers associated with their perception of realized expectations or the actual behavior of the students. In comparison, greater congruence between students and teachers for actual expectations (greater efficiency of communication) was found in both of the control groups while the perception of the students' actual behavior or realized expectations yielded less congruence than Ep, and, in the case of C2, a negative relation.

These relations may be seen in Figure 1. Here it is apparent that although the correlations were significantly different between groups that they were still fairly homogeneous with the obvious exception of the dramatic shift of C2 on Part III, realized expectations.

Students, Parts. In the same manner as reported in Table 3, congruence was determined for responses between the parts taken two at a time for the

TABLE 4

Significance of the Differences for Student-Teacher Correlations Among Ep, C1, and C2 on Parts I, II and III of the WAS

Comparison	z-test		
	Part I	Part II	Part III
Ep *vs.* C1	+ 6.871*	- 9.218*	+ 3.265*
Ep *vs.* C2	-11.292*	-13.367*	+28.129*
C1 *vs.* C2	-18.103*	- 4.150*	+24.864*

$SE_{z_1'-z_2'} = .0294$

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence

students within each program. These correlation coefficients and z transformations are presented in Table 5. These results are also presented graphically in Figure 2.

The z-tests of the differences between programs and their significance for the congruence of students' responses on the parts are shown in Table 6. Again all differences between programs were statistically significant at least at the .05 level.

As might be expected there was a high correlation between students' responses on Parts I and II of the WAS. These represented Explicit and Actual expectations (Table 5). However, for all three student groups the highest correlations can be observed between Parts II and III. These correlations represent the congruence of students' perception of what they are actually expected to do and what they actually do. As represented in Figure 2, the groups were again relatively homogeneous although the differences between groups were statistically significant

TABLE 5

Correlations of Students Between the Three Parts of the WAS for Ep, C1, and C2

Program	Statistics	Parts		
		I and II	I and III	II and III
Ep	r	+.592	+.486	+ .750
	z'	+.681	+.531	+ .806
C1	r	+.706	+.631	+.806
	z'	+.879	+.743	+1.115
C2	r	+.754	+.692	+ .856
	z'	+.982	+.852	+1.276

r = coefficient of correlation z' - Fisher z transformation

Parts	Line Graph of Correlation Coefficients								
Explicit and Actual							Ep	C1	C2
	-1.00	-.75	-.50	-.25	0	+.25	+.50	+.75	+1.00
Explicit and Realized							Ep	C1	C2
	-1.00	-.75	-.50	-.25	0	+.25	+.50	+.75	+1.00
Actual and Realized							Ep	C1	C2
	-1.00	-.75	-.50	-.25	0	+.25	+.50	+.75	+1.00

Figure 2. Graphic illustration of congruence of students among the three parts of the WAS for Ep, C1, and C2.

(Table 6). Here the relative positions of the groups remained the same for all three comparisons with Ep representing the lesser degree of congruence between parts and C2 the greater degree of congruence.

TABLE 6

Significance of the Differences of the Correlations Among Ep, C1, and C2 Between Parts of the WAS for Students

Comparison	z-test		
	I and II	I and III	II and III
Ep *vs.* C1	- 6.730*	- 7.211*	- 9.524*
Ep *vs.* C2	-10.238*	-10.918*	-15.000*
C1 *vs.* C2	- 3.503*	- 3.707	- 5.470*

$SE_{z_1'-z_2'} = .0294$

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Teachers, Parts. The congruences for responses between the parts taken two at a time for teachers were analyzed in the same manner as for the students. The nine correlation coefficients and z transformations are presented in Table 7. These results are also presented graphically in Figure 3.

The z-tests of the differences between programs and their significance for the congruence of the teachers' responses on the parts are presented in Table 8.

A relatively high degree of consistency was indicated for all teacher responses for Parts I and II, Explicit and Actual Expectations. Less consistency was found for the other comparisons for teachers between parts. Of particular note was the strong negative correlations between Part I, Explicit Expectations

TABLE 7

Correlations of Teachers Between the Three Parts of the WAS for Ep, C1, and C2

Program	Statistic	Parts		
		I and II	I and III	II and III
Ep	r	+.680	-.718	-.237
	z'	+.829	-.906	-.241
C1	r	+.555	+.207	+.156
	z'	+.626	+.210	+.157
C2	r	+.715	+.453	+.707
	z'	+.897	+.488	+.879

r = coefficient of correlation z' = Fisher z transformation

Parts	Line Graph of Correlation Coefficients								
Explicit and Actual							C1 Ep	C2	
	-1.00	-.75	-.50	-.25	0	+.25	+.50	+.75	+1.00
Explicit and Realized			Ep			C1	C2		
	-1.00	-.75	-.50	-.25	0	+.25	+.50	+.75	+1.00
Actual and Realized				Ep		C1		C2	
	-1.00	-.75	-.50	-.25	0	+.25	+.50	+.75	+1.00

Figure 3. Graphic illustration of congruence of teachers for Ep, C1, and C2 between the three parts of the WAS.

TABLE 8

Significance of the Differences of the Correlations Among Ep, Cl, and C2 Between Parts of the WAS for Teachers

Comparison	z-test		
	I and II	I and III	II and III
Ep *vs.* Cl	+66.905*	-37.959*	-13.537*
Ep *vs.* C2	- 2.313*	-47.415*	-38.095*
Cl *vs.* C2	- 9.218*	- 9.456*	-24.558*

$SE_{z_1'-z_2'} = .0294$

*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

and Part III, Realized Expectations for the teachers in the Experimental group. Although the difference was not as strong, it can also be seen in the Experimental teachers' perception of the relation between Part II, Actual Expectations, and Part III, Realized Expectations.

A second interesting relation is found in the statistics for C2, the most teacher-oriented group (see Sokol and Marshall, 1968). Teachers' responses of their perception of what students are actually expected to do and what they actually do were highly positively correlated. As can be noted in Table 5, students' responses on these two parts were also highly positively correlated. Yet the data in Table 3 indicated that for C2 there was a negative correlation between the students' perception of their actual behavior and the teachers' perception of the students' behavior. That is, even though the students in this program saw themselves doing what they were expected to do and the teachers saw

the students doing what they actually expect the students to do, the teachers and students were in *disagreement* as to what the students were actually doing.

When the correlations of the teachers' responses between parts were compared among the three programs they were found to be significantly different at least at the .05 level. Homogeneity among programs was still observable in Figure 3 for Parts I and II. However, this was not evident for Parts I and III or Parts II and III. Here the negative correlations of the Experimental group were readily observable.

Interpretations

As stated previously, efficiency of communication might be determined on the basis of the congruence data by noting the correlation between teachers and students on Part I or Part II. Although previous research has suggested a possible discrepancy between Explicit and Actual expectations there was no evidence of such a discrepancy in these data. In fact a high degree of correlation was attained for the Explicit and Actual expectations for students and teachers in each of the three programs.

The results of the congruence data *would not indicate* efficiency of communication of *specific* expectations. Yet, it would appear from the factor analyses data in the initial report that there is efficient communication of *generalized* role orientations.

Generally, there appears to be higher congruence between students and teachers in both of the Control groups than for those in the Experimental group. However, the statistics do not appear to support either a *strongly* positive or negative relation. Conversely, the original factor results for teachers and students in the Experimental group suggests a high consistency of role definition.

These data, examined in light of the consistent findings in the original factor solutions reported in the initial investigation, permit the following interpretations concerning the communication of expectations for the American Studies (Ep) group:

1. that the general program orientation has been communicated to the students;

2. that congruence exists between teachers and students for perception of actual student behavior;

3. that behavior tends to be in the direction of the generalized process orientation; and

4. that (a) students report that their realized behaviors are in accord with their perceptions of the teachers' expectations, *but* (b) teachers indicate that, in their perceptions, the students' realized behaviors are the converse of their expectations.

The negative relation between teacher and student perceptions might appear, taken by itself, to argue for lack of communication in this program. However, placing these data in the perspective of those presented earlier, another possible interpretation emerges. The factor data from the initial study indicated that the American Studies teachers were committed to the process orientation and that this orientation and the concomitant general expectations were communicated. Furthermore, the behavior of the students, according to the report of both student and teacher groups, diverged from the conventional practices found in the two American history groups. The previous two points, then, indicate that, although consistency can be observed in the general change in program orientation, change in terms of *specific behaviors* of students (role definition) has not - in the perceptions of the teachers - occurred to the degree which they would seem to desire.

This conjecture would seem to be supported by evidence on the relations noted for student-teacher congruence. As was previously pointed out in the

presentation of the findings, there was a lack of efficiency for the communication of specific expectations, particularly for the American Studies group as compared with the American history groups. However, a noteworthy reversal in this relation emerged when comparing the groups in terms of realized expectations. This would seem to indicate that, even though the communication of specific expectations from the American Studies teachers to their students is diffuse, as compared to the American history teachers, they *are highly sensitive* to the actual behaviors of the students in their program. Again, taking the results from the initial factor data and the congruence data in composite, it would seem to indicate that the procedures undertaken within the American Studies program have fostered increased sensitivity on the part of the teachers to each other as a viable team (Sokol and Marshall, 1968, p. 114) and toward the needs and behaviors of the students.

As might be expected from the nature of a program emphasizing student involvement in the learning process, the efficiency of communication of individual expectations is less than in the conventional programs. However, contradictory to the theoretical construct of roles and communication, it would appear that it is erroneous to assume that such lack of congruence is detrimental to the translation of a general goal orientation into actual behavior, or that it detracts from satisfaction with a program. It appears equally erroneous to assume that congruence of expectations *per se* leads to satisfaction even when the expectations are perceived by the participants as being realized. This is borne out by the fact that for the program demonstrating the greatest degree of congruence of expectations (C2) the students indicated that they *did not enjoy* the activities of the program, and that for the program demonstrating the least degree of congruence of expectations (Ep), the students indicated that they *did enjoy* the activities of the program.

These data suggest that satisfaction is more highly dependent on the nature of the students' role within a program. This role does appear to be defined by the teacher and communicated to the student who perceives it as being translated into behavior. This would indicate that students will perceive the general orientation of a program and will behave in a manner consistent with this orientation.

What the American Studies teachers communicate to the students as a group appears to be the general orientation for student behavior and not expectations for well delimited behavioral operations, per se.

References:

1. Balcom, Max. "American Studies." Impact of New Ideas in Education. School District of University City: University City, Missouri, 1968.

2. Berman, Louise M. New Priorities in the Curriculum. Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, Columbus, Ohio, 1968.

3. Broom, Leonard, and Selznick, Phillip. Sociology. Row, Peterson and Company, Evanston, Illinois, 1955.

4. Craig, Robert C. The Psychology of Learning in the Classroom. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1966.

5. Getzels, Jacob W., and Thelen, Herbert A., "The Classroom as a Unique Social System," in The Dynamics of Instructional Groups, edited by Nelson B. Henry, Fifty-ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part 2, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1960, pp. 53-82.

6. Hunt, Maurice P. and Metcalf, Laurence E. Teaching High School Social Studies. Harper and Row, Publishers, Evanston, 1968.

7. Massialas, Byron G. (ed.) The Indiana Experiments in Inquiry: The Social Studies Bulletin of the School of Education, vol. 39, no. 3, Indiana University, Bloomington, May, 1963.

8. Oliver, Donald W., and Shaver, James P. Teaching Public Issues in the High School. Houghton Miflin Company, Boston, 1966.

9. Snygg, Donald. "A Cognitive Field Theory of Learning." In Learning and Mental Health in the Schools. Walter B. Waetjen and Robert R. Leeper (eds.), Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), Washington, D.C., 1966, pp. 77-96.

10. Sokol, Alvin P. and Marshall, Jon C. Inquiry Into Innovations. School District of University City: University City, Missouri, 1968, pp. 33-145.

APPENDIX A

Watson Analysis Schedule

WATSON ANALYSIS SCHEDULE

Elizabeth P. Watson
University of Missouri - St. Louis

FORM A

DIRECTIONS

This inventory consists of 213 items designed to sample your opinions about given classroom procedures. The inventory is divided into three parts: (1) What students are *told* they are expected to do, (2) What students are *actually* expected to do, and (3) What students *actually do*. Each part contains directions for responding to that set of items. Be sure to read the directions carefully before responding to any of the items. When you have finished one part, go on to the next page.

Work as fast as possible. Since this is an individual matter, there are no right or wrong answers. Therefore, you should mark your first reaction to an item and then continue directly to the next item.

Do not write on this booklet. You are to mark your answers on a separate sheet which contains spaces for five responses per item. Be sure that you record your choice in the appropriate position. This inventory will be machine scored. Therefore, you are to use the pencil which has been provided to record your responses.

The items in this inventory consist of possible types of students' behaviors in a classroom setting.

If you are VERY SURE that the statement is <u>true</u>, blacken the space under "A"	■	B	C	D	E
If you are SOMEWHAT SURE that the statement is <u>true</u>, blacken the space under "B"	A	■	C	D	E
If you are UNDECIDED or UNCERTAIN <u>whether or not</u> the statement is <u>true</u>, blacken the space under "C"	A	B	■	D	E
If you are SOMEWHAT SURE that the statement is <u>not true</u>, blacken the space under "D"	A	B	C	■	E
If you are VERY SURE that the statement is <u>not true</u>, blacken the space under "E"	A	B	C	D	■

PLEASE RESPOND TO EVERY ITEM

For Experimental Use Only

PART I. WHAT STUDENTS ARE TOLD TO DO. Teachers generally tell students that certain types of behavior will be expected of them during a given course of instruction. Rate the correctness with which the following statements complete the sentence:

IN THIS CLASS, STUDENTS ARE TOLD THAT THEY ARE EXPECTED TO . . .

---

1. read from a required textbook.
2. use a wide range of materials other than a textbook.
3. help decide what is to be studied.
4. detect bias.
5. let the teacher decide what is to be studied.
6. suggest methods, materials, activities, etc. for studying.
7. select problems for study based on their own interests and experience.
8. study problems identified by the teacher.
9. select problems for study based on the experience and interests of citizens in our society.
10. study problems by following steps directed by the teacher.
11. develop their own methods of studying problems.
12. remember the names of men, places, events and dates.
13. be able to recognize or identify basic problems or conflicts in their studies.
14. remember the ideas and beliefs of great men.
15. recognize contradictions between the things people say they believe and the things people do.
16. discuss and take sides on issues related only to the past.
17. discuss and take sides on issues related to present-day living.
18. believe, in general, that statements and facts in the textbook and lectures are accurate and true.
19. question the accuracy of the facts gathered from the textbook or other sources.
20. make reports on assigned topics using encyclopaedias or similar sources.
21. be able to tell fact from opinion.
22. make reports or summarize their findings from studying a problem of their own choice.
23. define terms from their own understanding of the way the terms are used in their studies.
24. ask questions of the teacher and answer question from the teacher, largely from memory, on the assigned textbook, lectures or subject matter.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

IN THIS CLASS STUDENTS ARE TOLD THAT THEY ARE EXPECTED TO . . .

25. actively participate in discussions by answering questions from other students in order to develop the immediate problem of study.

26. draw their own conclusions at the end of the class period about the meaning of the lesson.

27. draw conclusions, as a group, about the meaning of the lesson.

28. let the teacher do most of the talking.

29. do most of the talking.

30. call attention to confused or unrelated statements made by the teacher.

31. listen to the teacher give lectures.

32. listen attentively to each other.

33. try out new things, put ideas and facts into new combinations.

34. take notes from teacher lectures.

35. record and organize their own ideas and conclusions in written or graphic form.

36. be responsible for remembering facts found in the textbook or teacher lectures.

37. get more facts than the textbook has when the facts are needed to understand basic problems.

38. be evaluated only on test scores and require written work.

39. be evaluated on everything they do including participation in discussions and formulating their ideas.

40. all be evaluated on the same basis.

41. be evaluated on an individual basis.

42. evaluate their own progress.

43. be evaluated on the amount of information they remember.

44. be evaluated on their ability in handling information to identify and solve problems.

45. suggest possible answers or solutions to questions or problems.

46. suggest procedures for getting information.

47. decide whether enough facts have been gathered to understand the problem being studied.

48. decide whether the facts being used to study a problem are really related to the problem in an important way.

49. use facts to support or reject ideas.

50. try to predict what will happen if a problem is left unsolved.

51. try to predict what will happen if a problem is solved in a given way.

52. learn how to make decisions in the real world.

53. learn how to recognize human social problems.

54. learn how to attack or solve social problems.

55. learn how to discover what is true and what is not true.

56. satisfy graduation requirements because of what is learned in class.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

STUDENTS ARE TOLD THAT THEY ARE EXPECTED TO . . .

57. be a better citizen because of what is learned in class.

58. look for underlying meaning in what is written or said.

59. change the way they behave in society because of what is learned in class.

60. understand human society because of what is learned in class.

61. understand themselves better because of what is learned in class.

62. learn the facts that they will need once they get out of school.

63. continue to learn in the same manner once they get out of school.

64. enjoy what they are doing.

65. make decisions that really matter.

66. study things that are useful only in school.

67. speak frankly in class.

68. believe that the teacher accepts them for what they are.

69. believe that the teacher understands them.

70. do unimportant tasks.

71. be interested in what is being studied.

GO TO PART II.

PART II. WHAT STUDENTS ARE EXPECTED TO DO. Teachers generally expect certain types of behavior from students during a given course of instruction. Rate the correctness with which the following statements complete the sentence:

IT IS MY OPINION THAT IN THIS CLASS STUDENTS ARE ACTUALLY EXPECTED TO . . .

72. read from a required textbook.
73. use a wide range of materials other than a textbook.
74. help decide what is to be studied.
75. detect bias.
76. let the teacher decide what is to be studied.
77. suggest methods, materials, activities, etc. for studying.
78. select problems for study based on their own interests and experience.
79. study problems identified by the teacher.
80. select problems for study based on the experience and interests of citizens in our society.
81. study problems by following steps directed by the teacher.
82. develop their own methods of studying problems.
83. remember the names, places events and dates.
84. be able to recognize or identify basic problems or conflicts in their studies.
85. remember the ideas and beliefs of great men.
86. recognize contradictions between the things people say they believe and the things people do.
87. discuss and take sides on issues related only to the past.
88. discuss and take sides on issues related to present-day living.
89. believe, in general, that statements and facts in the textbook and lectures are accurate and true.
90. question the accuracy of the facts gathered from the textbook or other sources.
91. make reports on assigned topics using encyclopaedias or similar sources.
92. be able to tell fact from opinion.
93. make reports or summarize their findings from studying a problem of their own choice.
94. define terms from their own understanding of the way the terms are used in their studies.
95. ask questions of the teacher and answer questions from the teacher, largely from memory, on the assigned textbook, lectures or subject matter.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

STUDENTS ARE ACTUALLY EXPECTED TO . . .

96. actively participate in discussions by answering questions from other students in order to develop the immediate problem of study.

97. draw their own conclusions at the end of the class period about the meaning of the lesson.

98. draw conclusions, as a group, about the meaning of the lesson.

99. let the teacher do most of the talking.

100. do most of the talking.

101. call attention to confused or unrelated statements made by the teacher.

102. listen to the teacher give lectures.

103. listen attentively to each other.

104. try out new things, put ideas and facts into new combinations.

105. take notes from teacher lectures.

106. record and organize their own ideas and conclusions in written or graphic form.

107. be responsible for remembering facts found in the textbook or teacher lectures.

108. get more facts than the textbook has when the facts are needed to understand basic problems.

109. be evaluated only on test scores and required written work.

110. be evaluated on everything they do including participation in discussions and formulating their ideas.

111. all be evaluated on the same basis.

112. be evaluated on an individual basis.

113. evaluate their own progress.

114. be evaluated on the amount of information they remember.

115. be evaluated on their ability in handling information to identify and solve problems.

116. suggest possible answers or solutions to questions or problems.

117. suggest procedures for getting information.

118. decide whether enough facts have been gathered to understand the problem being studied.

119. decide whether the facts being used to study a problem are really related to the problem in an important way.

120. use facts to support or reject ideas.

121. try to predict what will happen if a problem is left unsolved.

122. try to predict what will happen if a problem is solved in a given way.

123. learn how to make decisions in the real world.

124. learn how to recognize human social problems.

125. learn how to attack or solve social problems.

126. learn how to discover what is true and what is not true.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

STUDENTS ARE ACTUALLY EXPECTED TO . . .

STUDENTS ARE ACTUALLY EXPECTED TO . . .

127. satisfy graduation requirements because of what is learned in class.

128. be a better citizen because of what is learned in class.

129. look for underlying meaning in what is written or said.

130. change the way they behave in society because of what is learned in class.

131. understand human society because of what is learned in class.

132. understand themselves better because of what is learned in class.

133. learn the facts that they will need once they get out of school.

134. continue to learn in the same manner once they get out of school.

135. enjoy what they are doing.

136. make decisions that really matter.

137. study things that are useful only in school.

138. speak frankly in class.

139. believe that the teacher accepts them for what they are.

140. believe that the teacher understands them.

141. do unimportant tasks.

142. be interested in what is being studied.

GO TO PART III.

PART III. WHAT STUDENTS ACTUALLY DO. Students generally exhibit certain behavior during a given course of instruction. Rate the correctness with which the following statements complete the sentence:

IT IS MY OPINION THAT IN THIS CLASS STUDENTS ACTUALLY DO (ARE) . . .

143. read from a required textbook.

144. use a wide range of materials other than a textbook.

145. help decide what is to be studied.

146. detect bias.

147. let the teacher decide what is to be studied.

148. suggest methods, materials, activities, etc. for studying.

149. select problems for study based on their own interests and experience.

150. study problems identified by the teacher.

151. select problems for study based on the experience and interests of citizens in our society.

152. study problems by following steps directed by the teacher.

153. develop their own method of studying problems.

154. remember the names of men, places, events and dates.

155. able to recognize or identify basic problems or conflicts in their own studies.

156. remember the ideas and beliefs of great men.

157. recognize contradictions between the things people say they believe and the things people do.

158. discuss and take sides on issues related only to the past.

159. discuss and take sides on issues related to present-day living.

160. believe, in general, that statements and facts in the textbook and lectures are accurate and true.

161. question the accuracy of the facts gathered from the textbook or other sources.

162. make reports on assigned topics using encyclopaedias or similar sources.

163. able to tell fact from opinion.

164. make reports or summarize their own findings from studying a problem of their own choice.

165. define terms from their own understanding of the way the terms are used in their studies.

166. ask questions of the teacher and answer questions from the teacher, largely from memory, on the assigned textbook, lectures or subject matter.

167. actively participate in discussions by answering questions from other students in order to develop the immediate problem of study.

168. draw their own conclusions at the end of the class period about the meaning of the lesson.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

STUDENTS ACTUALLY DO (ARE) . . .

169. draw conclusions, as a group, about the meaning of the lesson.

170. let the teacher do most of the talking.

171. do most of the talking.

172. call attention to confused or unrelated statements made by the teacher.

173. listen to the teacher give lectures.

174. listen attentively to each other.

175. try out new things, put ideas and facts into new combinations.

176. take notes from teacher lectures.

177. record and organize their own ideas and conclusions in written or graphic form.

178. responsible for remembering facts found in the textbook or teacher lectures.

179. get more facts than the textbook has when the facts are needed to understand basic problems.

180. evaluated only on test scores and required written work.

181. evaluated on everything they do including participation in discussions and formulating their ideas.

182. all evaluated on the same basis.

183. evaluated on an individual basis.

184. evaluate their own progress.

185. evaluated on the amount of information they remember.

186. be evaluated on their ability in handling information to identify and solve problems.

187. suggest possible answers or solutions to questions or problems.

188. suggest procedures for getting information.

189. decide whether enough facts have been gathered to understand the problem being studied.

190. decide whether the facts being used to study a problem are really related to the problem in an important way.

191. use facts to support or reject ideas.

192. try to predict what will happen if a problem is left unsolved.

193. try to predict what will happen if a problem is solved in a given way.

194. learn how to make decisions in the real world.

195. learn how to recognize human social problems.

196. learn how to attack or solve social problems.

197. learn how to discover what is true and what is not true.

198. satisfy graduation requirements because of what is learned in class.

199. better citizens because of what is learned in class.

200. look for underlying meaning in what is written or said.

201. change the way they behave in society because of what is learned in class.

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE.

STUDENTS ACTUALLY DO (ARE) . . .

202. understand human society because of what is learned in class.

203. understand themselves better because of what is learned in class.

204. learn the facts that they will need once they get out of school.

205. continue to learn in the same manner once they get out of school.

206. enjoy what they are doing.

207. make decisions that really matter.

208. study things that are useful only in school.

209. speak frankly in class.

210. believe that the teacher accepts them for what they are.

211. believe that the teacher understands them.

212. do unimportant tasks.

213. interested in what is being studied.